DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 315 822 CS 507 061

AUTHOR Anderson, Tracy M.
TITLE "According to...": Toward Standards for the Ethical Use of Evidence in Individual Events.
PUB DATE 20 Nov 89
NOTE 19p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association (75th, San Francisco, CA, November 18-21, 1989).
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120) -- Guides - Non-Classroom Use (055) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Citations (References); Communication Research; *Debate; *Evaluation Methods; Guidelines; Higher Education; Judges; Measurement Techniques; *Persuasive Discourse; *Plagiarism; Speech Instruction
IDENTIFIERS Communication Competencies; *Debate Ethics; *Debate Tournaments; Style Manuals

ABSTRACT

Guidelines for citing sources in forensic competition are needed for use by students, as well as by coaches and judges. The first step toward developing standardized guidelines could be an adaptation of the Modern Language Association's American Handbook for Writers of Research Papers, which provides clear-cut definitions of plagiarism, fabrication, and distorted evidence and includes examples of incorrect as well as acceptable ways of citing and using sources. The next step would be for the profession to create its own standardized publication which speakers, coaches, and judges would use. This publication should have individual events-oriented and debate-oriented authors, to allow for all essential information needed by the forensic community to be placed in one reference. (Detailed examples of direct plagiarism, fabrication, and distorted evidence most likely to be found in speeches are included.) (KEH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED315822

"ACCORDING TO...": TOWARD STANDARDS FOR THE ETHICAL USE OF EVIDENCE IN INDIVIDUAL EVENTS

TRACY M. ANDERSON
THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN
P.O. BOX 7879
AUSTIN, TX 78712

Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the Speech Communication Association, San Fransisco, CA.
November 20, 1989

CS 507061

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Tracy M. Anderson
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

RATIONALE:

When we planned the program, this panelist had hoped to use a survey of judges and coaches to compare what evidentiary usage was acceptable on the circuit to what was expected using standards already determined. However, a review of the literature produced on the topic did not lend itself to this type of comparison. In fact, while much has been written on the need for such standards on sourcing in forensic competition, standards themselves have not been made specific to public address events. Even the general standards are not widely known.

The revised approach for this presentation includes a background on the development of broad ethical standards for the use of evidence, guidelines (developed through the use of the MLA Handbook for Writers of Research and American Forensic Association's Code of Ethics), and some possible steps for developing a formal set of citation guidelines for the forensic coach and competitor.

BACKGROUND:

Concern for the proper use of evidence in forensic competition, and public address events specifically, have grown during the last decade. The 1980 season opened with the National Forensic Association's newly adopted "Code of Ethics". With regard to evidence the code requires that

> Those portions of any written speech which are the ideas or actual words of any author other than the student himself must be credited to the actual author (NFA Guidelines 1983, p.60).

In 1982, the American Forensic Association offered a revised edition of the "Code of Forensic Program and Forensic Tournament Standards for Colleges and Universities". This code (cited in Friedley, 1983), more extended than the NFA's, was reprinted in a article by Friedley(1983) and says Forensic competitors should not use fabricated or distorted evidence. The organization's code also gives extended definitions of fabrication and distortion as well as plagiarism. Although specific examples are not given, AFA calls for the MLA Standards to be an advising force.

In 1984, the National Developmental Conference on Forensics adopted several resolutions pertaining to evidence citations. On a general front the committee on the "Ethics of Forensics" wrote (1984)

> The forensic community has an obligation to call attention to ethical issues and disseminate information on the ethics of forensics (Parson, 1984. p. 19).

Recognizing the tremendous burden student authors face, the Conference adopted a second resolution from the ethics committee which suggested

> The American Forensic Association should publish and disseminate a speakers guidebook of scholarly citations to assist students in properly crediting materials used in forensic competition (Parson, p. 19).

Ethics committee member Frank (1984) of the University of Oregon suggested that the guidebook be a speaker's equivalent to the MLA Handbook (Parson, 1984, p. 22).

Despite the calls for greater attention to citations in prepared events, little has been done to create the "guidebook" which would provide examples for use by students or standards for use by coaches and judges.[1]

The result has been fragmented thoughts on source citations. While we do have clear-cut ideas on fabrication, other areas are still grey matter. As Thomas (1983) found in one survey of contestants and judges, most respondents will agree with the statement "...fabricating evidence is the worst ethical violation a contestant can commit in a rhetorical forensic event"(p. 12). Yet the same survey showed that over one-half of the judges disagreed with the statement "Orators should be held to the same evidence citation rules as debaters." This suggests that fabricating is definitely unacceptable but that requiring the extended sourcing typical of evidence used in debate would be undesirable. Yet, most would probably agree that this increased citation burden would certainly prohibit blatant fabrication and help to correct the careless mistakes a student might make.

The lack of guidelines has had a great effect on forensic competition and could present an even greater problem in the future. More than one student has been branded negatively following a question of evidence abuse. And as National Developmental Conference on Forensics committee

---

[1]In fact, as my colleagues' presentations will suggest, the reprints of award-winning speeches competitors and coaches currently reference are ofthen the least desirable source of proper evidence use.

member Keefe (1984) of West Chester University suggests "The misuse of sources can be shown to have undesirable effects upon the communication process" (Parson, 1984, p.21). With the purpose of forensic activity in jeopardy, our concern should be translated into a mandate for stronger guidelines as we head into the next decade.

TOWARD GUIDELINES:

In order to provide some standardization on sourcing in prepared events, I suggest that we begin with an adaptation fo the Modern Language Association of American Handbook for Writers of Research Papers. This seems to be an appropriate device given the number of references to this manual when addressing the ethics in evidence issue. While the author recognizes that speaking events do vary from research papers, the standards set by the MLA can be adequately adapted to the forensic speaker's needs.

For the purposes of these guidelines, the following definitions, as outlined by the the MLA Handbook and AFA Code of Ethics will be used:

Plagiarism is the act of using another person's ideas or expressions in your writing without acknowledging the source (Gibaldi & Achert, 1984, p.20)

Fabrication refers to falsely representing a cited fact or statement of opinion or evidence when the material in question is not authentic (Cited in Friedley, 1983, p.113).

Distorted Evidence refers to misrepresenting the actual or implied context of factual or opinion evidence [(Cited in Friedley, 1983, p. 113), additional aspects of distorted evidence will be presented in the text of this paper.].

With these definitions established, we can use the MLA framework on plagiarism as a format to creating our own guidelines. Like the MLA, I have set up the examples with the original source, the incorrect way of citing the source, and an acceptable way of using the source.

DIRECT PLAGIARISM

(Note: For this section I have used information from a Discover November 1989 issue which one of my student's utilizes in an Informative Speech)

Original Source: The excited electrons, swarming around the tube like angry bees, generate electromagnetic waves. These waves come in all shapes and sizes-or, more precisely, all wavelengths and frequencies.

Goofus:[2] Electrons are like angry bees in a tube. They make electromagnetic waves in all sizes and shapes-or, if you are into scientific terms, all frequencies and wavelengths.

The citation has two problems. First the source is not identified. Second, the section is almost directly "lifted" from the Discover article. A student could convey the clever analogy and avoid any question of plagiarism by citing the information in the following manner.

---

[2] Goofus and Gallant are two cartoon characters beloved of children waiting in dentists' offices throughout the U;.S. *Highlights* Magazine first used their names extensively. As their names suggest, Goofus can do no right,and Gallant can do no wrong.

Gallant: The November 1989 edition of Discover magazine likens electrons to angry bees in a tube which create electromagnetic waves of all frequencies and lengths.

Using a particularly apt phrase

Original Source: The key was to find a way to slow the heating rate of the carmel so that the popcorn popped before the carmel burned. ...He experimented with various additives that could be mixed in the carmel coating and act as "thermal brakes."

Goofus: The key to capitalizing on the consumers craving for carmelcorn was finding thermal brakes in the microwaving process.

Once again, Goofus is in a plagiarizing situation. Although the paraphrasing is distinct enough from the original, the term "thermal brakes" is the type of particularly apt phrase the MLA commands us to cite. By crediting the source of the idea, Gallant is able to utilize the concept and keep himself out of a sticky situation.

Gallant: At this point in the process food engineers needed what Discover magazine of November 1989 calls "thermal brakes".

Presenting author's line of thinking as your own

Original Source: Microwave ovens may have a respectably long history, but it is only recently that researchers have come to understand just how the oven works.

Goofus: Today we'll examine microwave ovens, the machines with a long history but only recently understood impact.

Here, the speaker has implied that this train of thought is their own. While the statement does lend itself to a speech, and specifically a preview, there would be a more appropriate way (from an ethical standpoint) to use the statement.

Gallant: Today we'll examine what this month's Discover magazine called a process with a respectably long history which has only recently been fully understood.

FABRICATION

Original Source: Doctors have known for thousands of years that heat kills tumors...they were jabbing red-hot irons into cancerous growths back in Hippocrate's time.

Goofus: Microwaves are capable of zapping all of our medical problems including cancer, heart disease, and even AIDS.

Although the original source used is only small portion of the article, it is easy to see that the focus is on cancer and only cancer. Goofus fabricates the content. Of course there is little need to as is demonstrated by Gallant.

Gallant: Microwaves are able to kill cancerous tumors through tremendously high temperatures.

Quoting out of context

(Note: Once again I am using information from a November 1989 Discover magazine currently being used by one of my students)

The distinction here is that quoting out of context is taking a portion of a source and presenting it as an accurate representation of the entire source when the spirit of the source is not present in the citation.

In this example, the article which is referenced deals with the many explanations for the impact sunspots are currently having on the atmosphere.

Original Source: Two atmospheric scientists have recently proposed that a host of climactic phenomena fluctuate in step with the 11 year sunspots cycle. The claim is controversial.

Goofus: Discover magazine in November 1989 explains that high winds and severe temperatures are due to the sunspot cycle.

Although the speaker has given us an accurate source for the information, the context of the citation is misrepresented. The Discover article clearly acknowledges that this is only one explanation and a controversial one at that. Gallant is able to present the idea of the correlation between weather and sunspots and represent the spirit of the article more aptly.

Gallant: One explanation for the uncharacteristically high winds and low temperatures was given in this months Discover magazine. It says that two atmospheric scientists have been able to link these occurrences with the 11 year cycle of sunspots.

Omitting salient information

This is similar to quoting out of context in that is misrepresents the intent of a source. The distinction here is that a portion of a source can be distorted. In other words, with this standard we are looking at the micro aspect of a source.

Original Source: ...Researchers have charted the sunspot cycle through 21 repetitions, and they've found that its period varies from 9 to 13 years, with an average of 11.

Goofus: The November 1989 edition of Discover magazine says that sunspots are on an 11 year cycle.

Certainly this is not a major violation of omitting salient information. But it is the type of omission which causes confusion and presents an inaccurate piece of information. It seems that the most appropriate rule of thumb should be always err on the side more information.

Gallant: Sunspots are in a cycle which according to Discover of November 1989, ranges from 9 to 13 years with an average of 11 years.

Adding words to a quotation

Example #1:

Original Source: As Taylor Branch explains in his 1988 book Parting the Waters: America in the King Years, for King himself, it *remained to be seen* how much Kennedy's ideas of freedom overlapped with his.

Goofus: For King himself it remained *never* to be seen how much Kennedy's ideas of freedom overlapped with his.

Example #2

Original Source: *Nearly* 60 million Americans have cholesterol levels high enough to require medical treatment.

Goofus: *Over* 60 million Americans have cholesterol levels high enough to require treatment.

Of course in either case, Gallant would have used the exact wording of the original source so as not to misrepresent the information.

Split-sourcing

One aspect of this standard which is not specifically addressed as an example in the AFA guidelines. That is the problem of split-sourcing. Frank's (1983) definition of pseudo-cites explains that pseudo citation is a clever device by which a speaker can intimate that he has researched a dozen sources when he has actually researched only one (p.102).

Original Source: While the list of ordinary elements runs out at atomic number 109, at that point a strange matter would just be beginning. "It keeps on going to arbitrary heights, " says Charles Alcock, a theoretician at Lawrence Livermore Laboratory in California.

Goofus: Discover magazine of November 1989 explains that the list of ordinary elements runs out at atomic number 109. But matter may actual go beyond this point. Lawrence Livermore Laboratory theoretician Charles Alcock says it keeps on going to arbitrary heights.

Goofus has suggested that he has researched two sources for this portion of his speech when, in reality, it is taken from the same source- Discover magazine. Gallant is able to use the same citation without ethical violations.

Gallant: Discover Magazine of November 1989 says that strange matter begins where the list of ordinary elements runs out at-atomic number 109.

A theoretician at Lawrence Livermore Laboratory in California goes on to explain in that same Discover magazine article that matter can go to arbitrary heights.

Failure to provide complete documentation

The AFA Code of Ethics lists author, source of publication, full date, page number, and authors credentials as the necessary components of evidence to be used in competition. Although this might be ideal, and it is able to be used in debate, it is impractical for public speaking. However, source of publication, full date, and author with credentials (when appropriate) should be used.

Inappropriate citations would include (but are not limited to):

- The Wall Street Journal reports that unemployment remained remained at 5.4% in October.

- Dr. Joyce Brothers has found that divorce often leads to child abuse.

- According to Time in 1989, the Star Wars defense budget will be cut by 5%.

The following are some guidelines we might provide to student authors/speakers.

When using a newspaper or magazine:

Give the title of the periodical

Give the the exact date of the periodical (including the year)

The Wall Street Journal of November 13, 1989

The November 13, 1989 Wall Street Journal

When using a specific author:

Give the full name of the author

Give the credential (if that is not apparent)

Give the full citation of the reference where the author's thoughts have been found.

Dr Joyce Brother, psychologist and family therapist, explains in the November 13 Time magazine of this year....

When using a book:

Give the full title of the book

Give the year of the book

Give the author(s) of the book

In the 1983 book Cult Movies #3, author Danny Peary describes Chilly Scenes of Winter as a contemporary success story.

When using a personal interview:

Identify the information source

Give the exact date of the interview

Give the name and credentials of the interviewee.

Astronomer C. M. Fly from Central University explained the seriousness of sunspots to me during a personal interview on November 1st of this year.

SUMMARY

Certainly these ideas are only the beginning. Although they give some solid examples to speakers, this paper does not (and did not seek to) give all the possibilities. However, we might consider this a format from which to work.

With regard to the next steps in the process. The following is recommended.

For the (distant) future:

1. The Council on Forensic Organizations should initiate a taskforce to build on the ideas of the AFA and the National Developmental Conference (as I have done). This organization of organizations could ultimately create a publication which speakers, coaches and, judges would utilize. It would also begin to exapand (in the case of some organizations) referencing requirements and standardize guidelines for sourcing in the activity.

2. The handbook should have an individual events-oriented and debate-oriented author. This would allow for all information needed by the forensic community to be placed in one reference.

3. Organizations should make the use of evidence, in accordance with the handbook, a standard for judging the speaker.

In the future (short-term):

1. All forensic organizations should require that public speakers have a fully cited (including page numbers) copy of the speech available at all national tournaments. The National Forensic Association currently requires a manuscript be available [3]

2. Forensic organizations which allocate funds to the production of a "championship publication" should send funds with a requirement that editors research a sampling (if not all) of the citations to determine if the speech is an exemplar as its' inclusion in the publication suggests.[4]

3. Organizations which are presented with a possible abuse of evidence should seek to set an example by taking action based on the established standards for the use of evidence (no matter how broad) rather

---

[3] It would nice to have this each time a student competes. However, the additional amount of worker a speaker would have to put in on a week to week basis would be prohibitive.

[4] I hope this will not be interpreted as an indict of the very useful *Championship Debates and Speeches* publication. Like the videotapes of the final rounds, distributed material for the use of example should follow the standards we seek to attain.

than to discredit those who call attention to a possible problem. When the latter action prevails, judges and coaches are discouraged (usually) from monitoring this information and students are lulled into a false sense of security. Neither is healthy for an information ladden actvity where sourcing builds credibility.

We should, as Friedley (1983) suggests, hold students responsible for the use of evidence in their speeches. However, without an example of what is considered acceptable in this highly unique extracurricular activity we cannot meet our educational mission to foster more informed, more articulate, and more communicative individuals.

REFERENCES

American Forensic Association Professional Relations Committee. (1982). Code of forensic program and forensic tournament standards for colleges and universities. AFA Newsletter, June, 12-13.

Bartusiak, M. (1989, November). The sunspot syndrome. Discover, pp. 45-52.

Branch, T. (1988). Parting the waters: America in the king years. New York: Simson and Schuster.

Frank, R. L. (1983). The abuse of evidence in persuasive speaking. National Forensic Journal, 1(2), 97-107.

Friedley, S. A. (1983). Ethics and evidence usage: Current "codes" in individual events. National Forensic Journal, 1(2), 109-117.

Gibaldi, J., & Achtert, W. S. (1984). MLA handbook for writers of research papers (2nd ed.). New York: MLA.

N.F.A. Guidelines for Competition. (1983). National Forensic Journal, 1 (1), 59-61.

Peary, D. (1988). Cult movies #3. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Roman, M. (1989, November). The little waves that could. Discover, pp. 54-60.

Thomas, D. A. (1983). The ethics of proof in speech events: A survey of standards used by contestants and judges. National Forensic Journal, 1(1), 1-17.

Ulrich, W. (1984). The ethics of forensics. In D. Parson (Ed.), American Forensics in Perspective: Papers from the Second National Conference on Forensics (pp. 13-22). Annandale, Virginia: Speech Communication Association.

Vogel, S. (1989, November). Strange matter. Discover, pp. 63-67.